

you have that trust fund, you don't need to worry about where your next dollar is coming from. It is coming from the labors and fruits of your parents or grandparents and the blue blood trust fund boys and girls in here don't know how to figure out how to balance the budget. Some of us have had to work all of our lives, and we know when you spend that hard-earned tax dollar of those that we are extracting it from, that it is a sacrifice from them.

It is my hope that this Congress wises up and stops being as partisan as they quite frankly have been and start addressing the issues in a transparent way with oversight and accountability.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I think Congressman DAVIS makes a fine point because I think it is one of the reasons so many of our constituents feel disconnected from Washington. They cannot relate to what is going on on the Hill. Most of us come from a real-world background. We have run businesses, and we have certainly run our personal finances in such a way that you could never manage the way we are mismanaging our Federal dollars.

We are now borrowing \$26 billion per month. That is an outrageous figure, and it is highly irresponsible. As a result, we are spending \$15 billion per month just on interest payments alone. There are so many good works we could be doing in government if we were not being so fiscally irresponsible. This is reckless borrow and spend profligacy.

To go back to what Congressman ROSS mentioned, those mobile homes were well-intended to help people who needed temporary housing in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Are those being utilized? No. We don't as a Congress historically look back. We are not using legislation like Congressman TANNER's to audit and use performance measurement criteria, to see that if we are going to make the investment in those mobile homes, someone is actually going to live in them.

The concept of return on investment, something in the business world that we live by, is just absent from this Congress. The American public expects us to do a better job in that regard.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. So what you are saying is that we need an audit of America, just like we would our businesses.

Ms. BEAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I agree with Congressman TANNER on that. Just audit America and we will figure out what the problems are.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for our people back home to understand that Congress appropriates the money for the executive agencies to spend. Of course the President has to sign those appropriations bills and put them into law and then the executive agency spends that money. But it is inherent upon us, and the framers of the Constitution presumed, that Congress would then provide oversight to

make sure that the executive agencies were spending the money like it was designed to be spent by Congress or desired to be spent and not wasting it and that is where we have gone wrong with this.

It could have happened maybe with the other side, but you have one party controlling the White House, the House and the Senate; and the House and the Senate seem to have just abdicated their oversight responsibility.

Why couldn't we have hearings to find out about those six Mercedes and over \$6 million? Why couldn't we have hearings to find out about the FEMA mismanagement?

The Department of Defense is the worst. There is an article that was published in Vanity Fair this month that I could commend that talks about some of the corruption going on in this government. And the reason for that it basically says is because Congress has abdicated its oversight responsibility, and in many cases the Department of Defense has been complicit in just allowing these things to go on without asking the tough questions.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. When you talk about our national defense, I want to talk about Iraq. In Iraq, the maximum petroleum that was being produced in Iraq was 3.5 million barrels a day. That is over a billion barrels a year. At \$70 a barrel, it has been running \$60 to \$70 a barrel for the last year almost, you are talking about \$60 billion to \$70 billion. Where is that money going, Mr. President? Where is that money going, Mr. Secretary of Defense? Where is that money being spent? Are we producing that as we told the American public we would be?

I understand it is down to a million and a half barrels; but even at that, we are still talking in terms of \$30 billion to \$40 billion. Why are we still sending money to help rebuild Iraq?

I think there are many things that we need oversight on, and the mismanagement that we are seeing of this administration and of this Congress is something that every American ought to be screaming about today.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) for joining me for this Special Order this evening.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to demonstrate that if given the opportunity as Democrats, we are prepared and ready to lead this Nation. We are prepared to lead this Nation in restoring fiscal responsibility and accountability to our government. We are not just here to point out what is wrong with this Republican administration and Republican Congress. We are here to offer up real commonsense solutions to fix these things.

We have talked about them in the last hour, the 12-point reform plan for curing our Nation's addiction to deficit

spending through budget reform. We have talked about Mr. TANNER's bill, House Resolution 841, to require congressional hearings when a Federal Office of Inspector General report documenting fraud, waste, abuse or mismanagement in the government results in a cost to the government of at least \$1 million.

We have talked about the need for other ideas that we have that we are advancing, like the idea of the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) with H.R. 5315, a bill that would require a Federal agency to produce an audit within 2 years that complies with the standards established in the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996. If they can't do that, the Senate would hold reconfirmation hearings on any Cabinet-level official whose agency cannot fully account for its spending within 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, this past hour has been about accountability. It has been about our government being accountable for every tax dollar it spends.

Mr. Speaker, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are ready, willing and able to lead this Congress if given the opportunity.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. We call this the Blue Dog Coalition, not Blue Dog Democrats. We are all Democrats, but we invite the Republicans to join us so we can bring some sense to this fiscal irresponsibility. I hope some Republicans will join this coalition because it is not limited just to Democrats. Most Blue Dogs are conservative Democrats, at least when it comes to fiscal matters. And we are also hawks on defense spending, so we invite Republicans to join us.

Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the gentleman making that point. We would welcome Republicans to join us. We would welcome an opportunity for Republicans to give us a hearing and a vote on these bills that we are trying to submit to restore some fiscal discipline and commonsense to our national government.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the profound honor to address you in this Chamber. It is a privilege that has been experienced by only a small number of Americans throughout the years.

I come to the floor this afternoon and evening to address the issues that are important to us today. I intend to bring up the issues that have to do with our border control, border security and enforcement of our Nation's laws, and to talk about the facts behind them, the reasons that the American people clearly see this issue as a necessity for enforcement, and the reasons why establishing a guest worker/

temporary worker plan in the middle of an unknown set of circumstances with regard to enforcement simply has too many hypotheticals involved in it to be able to build a good logical plan.

And to make that case, I would state that there are times in one's life when we are called upon to make large decisions, decisions that have tremendous impact, decisions that reflect and echo across through the generations. It might be the generations of our family, it might be the generations of our neighborhood. In this case, we are talking about the generations of Americans for a long time to come.

There are two opposing competing forces in this immigration field today. One of them is this powerful force that is the heart and soul of the center of America, that we need to enforce the laws that we have. We need to control our borders. We can't be a Nation if we don't have a border, and we can't call ourselves a Nation if we don't enforce our border.

That is something that is a basic fundamental that the American people know. They may not sit down and articulate it every day. They may not actually intellectualize it. They may not go back and read all of these immigration laws that we have. They may not look back and see the responsibility we have constitutionally to establish immigration laws here in this Congress. They may not do all that. They might just have a subliminal sense that is what we should do because it is common sense; it makes sense. To some it is in their gut instead of their brain, but they can trust their gut because their instincts are right on this.

They understand we have to enforce the laws here in America; and if we don't do that, we won't be forever America. That is the position on the enforcement side. That is in one corner of this prize fight debate going on across America.

In the other corner are the people that say that they are for a policy for guest worker, temporary worker. They are for a policy of amnesty by any other name, but amnesty. They have been seeking for years now to redefine the term "amnesty." You can look it up in the dictionary, but the definition I keep being told I should accept is the argument of what would not be amnesty. It would not be amnesty if someone came into this country, broke the law to come in here and broke the law to stay here, and they stayed here a long time, 5 years or more. Their roots went down. They made some money. They sent a lot back to their home country. They started a family. Maybe they bought some property. Maybe they are a valuable employee to an important business that is in the community. They sent their roots down.

Now, they are law breakers. Whether they overstayed their visa or whether they jumped the border illegally, they broke the law. So then the argument is it isn't amnesty if you just say to them we think you are a pretty good citizen,

other than the fact that you broke the law. We would like to just give you amnesty, but in order to avoid this argument, because we know Americans reject the idea and the concept and the real definition of amnesty, we are going to redefine it. So if you just pay a fine of \$1,500 or \$2,000, or the Senate kind of ratcheted it up in some cases to as much as \$3,200, if you just pay the fine, that takes care of your punishment.

□ 1730

So it is no longer going to be amnesty because you have paid a price for breaking the law. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not necessarily so much as pay the price as that it puts these people on a path to citizenship.

The Senate language does that. The path to citizenship is an objective that is more than was asked for by the people who came here illegally. Many of them just wanted to work here and make money and send their money back home, or save money and go back to their home country and perhaps retire. But we are offering them the plum of citizenship for a price. And the price is maybe \$1,500 or \$2,000 or \$3,000 or \$3,200. But citizenship for a price.

And that price, I believe, is cheap; and I think it cheapens the citizenship. Citizenship should be sacred. It should be precious, and it is to those who are Americans by choice, who got in line, waited long years to come into the United States, came here, learned to speak English, learned to write English, learned about our history, learned about our culture, learned about our civilization and went through that process of naturalization and became Americans by choice, naturalized American citizens.

And I have had the privilege to speak at a number of those naturalization services in my district. And those are some very, very proud days for me, Mr. Speaker, but they are far more, as far as proud days are concerned, for the naturalized citizens. That is a highlight of their life. And in their lifetime, of the things that matter to them, the day of the citizenship ceremony stands out. It stands out and maybe stands with the day they get married perhaps, maybe the day of their first-born child, those kinds of milestones in life.

The naturalization service and ceremony is a milestone that stands with the very finest events in our lifetimes. And so those people that came here and became naturalized citizens, they don't want to see amnesty for people who jumped the border to get here or broke the laws to stay here. They know what amnesty is, and they don't want to see their citizenship cheapened by having it for sale, putting it up for a \$1,500, \$2,000 or \$3,200 check.

What price citizenship for America? Priceless. But you have to demonstrate that you are going to respect the laws and live by the rule of law.

And so, some time back, I went to a groundbreaking ceremony for a, it was

an \$81 million expansion of a plant in my district. There was an individual there who was protesting me, and his signs said things such as, I am a former or a current illegal immigrant, and I believe that we ought to give amnesty to these people that are here illegally, and they should have a path to citizenship—different phrases to express what I have just said.

And so I find out afterwards that he is not shy about saying he is also a former illegal immigrant who was granted amnesty in the 1986 amnesty that was signed by Ronald Reagan.

So here is an individual who jumped the border, came here illegally, living presumably in the shadows. 1986 rolled around, and by the stroke of a pen over at the White House, he and more than 3 million others received amnesty. Now he is out protesting in the streets, declaring that 10 or 12 million or, more appropriately, 60 to 90 million people should have the same path to citizenship that he achieved by the stroke of a Presidential pen 20 years ago. And he is advocating that people break the law, jump the border, come here and make demands on American taxpayers and demands for a path to United States citizenship after they have shown contempt for the laws of the United States of America.

And their first act was to break the law of the United States of America. The very first moment they set foot on this soil across that border, they broke American law. And they march in the streets and demonstrate in the streets, with flags from other countries often, and argue that they are not criminals.

But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if they cross the border illegally, they are guilty of a criminal misdemeanor. By definition, it is a criminal misdemeanor punishable by less than a year in jail. I think it is 6 months, actually. But that is a criminal misdemeanor. That makes them criminals if they are guilty of this crime.

It isn't the Congress that has passed a law in H.R. 4437 that makes them criminals. That would make them felons. And they are arguing that they are not criminals.

Yes, they are. They are criminals. They haven't been adjudicated to be criminals yet, but they admit to their criminal action. They just say, don't call me a criminal.

Well, respect our laws, please. And if you do that and you don't break our laws, then we won't call you a criminal. And, in fact, we wouldn't be moving legislation that would identify felons either by that standard, Mr. Speaker.

And so people who are granted amnesty, who have broken our laws, have contempt for the rest of our laws because they have profited from breaking our laws. And that is the wrong kind of reward. If we reward lawbreakers with citizenship, what are you going to get? More lawbreakers.

The same Ronald Reagan that only let me down about twice in 8 years in

office, and I have mentioned one of those times. That same Ronald Reagan said, what you tax you get less of. What you subsidize you get more of. And you know if you subsidize law-breaking you are going to get more law-breaking. Mr. Speaker, not less. You aren't going to be able to draw a line in the sand and say now we are not going to tolerate any more law-breaking.

There is no will in this country right now within the administration to enforce the laws we have. And the White House is working against the laws that we are trying to pass asking for more enforcement. And they are working with MCCAIN, KENNEDY, HAGEL and MARTINEZ over in the Senate, working on their version of amnesty, saying we are for this. We are opposed to amnesty, but we think we ought to be giving people a path to citizenship who broke the laws to come here. They just should have to do this rigorous process of moving towards American citizenship and finding this path to citizenship, and it includes learning English and keeping a job and paying some of your taxes.

That sounds like a lot, doesn't it? Paying some of your taxes should give you a path to citizenship, not all of your taxes, some of your taxes, 3 out of the last 5 years. You pick the 3 years to pay the taxes in.

Well, I would like to be able to do that. I had a couple of good years out of the last 5. I would like to take those out and say, send me my money back, Uncle Sam. That was a little tough on me. And I want to do this. If we are going to give this to people who broke the laws to come here and who aren't paying any taxes, to offer them, you pick the lowest 3 out of the last 5 years and pay your taxes, and we will give you this plum of citizenship, I think we are going to have millions and millions of people who don't pay any income tax at all.

In fact, we have that today. So this function of just pay your taxes 3 out of the last 5 years, it will be okay. That is not amnesty. I am saying that, itself, is amnesty to not require them to pay those taxes.

Another argument that is in the Senate bill is, well, they have been here working, they have been paying Social Security taxes, so surely you will want to grant them credit for the money that they earned so that they can collect their Social Security and put pressure on that system when they reach that retirement level.

Mr. Speaker, they earned the money illegally. If they weren't here working here legally, their earnings are not legal either. And to reward them with a retirement fund when our Social Security is going to go bankrupt if we don't overhaul that Social Security, and on that case, the President has been right all along, the need of a personal retirement accounts, need to overhaul Social Security, put more pressure on it because the Senate somehow believes it is not fair.

It isn't just if we don't grant people that have been working here against the law the benefits that come with that in the form of retirement and SSI. Their families are going to benefit from this as well, the death benefit that goes along with it, the disability benefit that comes along with it, because they have been earning money under a false Social Security number. And somehow we are going to ratify and certify and give people a benefit for having broken the laws of the United States of America. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

And so, Social Security is one piece of this. And putting citizenship up for sale is another piece. And how do you determine the value of that citizenship? Do you grant that by what is a coyote charging today? Is it \$1,500, \$2,000, \$3,200 in order to get passage into the United States illegally? Whatever that price is, it seems to be indexed pretty closely to the price that citizenship is for sale over in the United States Senate. That is how I would describe what is going on here: citizenship for sale in the United States Senate, running contrary to the rule of law, undermining American values, weakening our entire culture and building, not shutting off the jobs magnet, but turning on the current to the jobs magnet with even more amperage, Mr. Speaker.

Because once this carrot of citizenship, this path towards amnesty that would be granted under the Senate language happens, there will be untold millions more come across the border that want to come here and take advantage of the amnesty that has been offered, or if they aren't able to get on that particular bandwagon, then they will want to take advantage of the next inevitable amnesty that will come along.

There have been seven amnesties in the last 20 years. We talk about the 1986 amnesty; there have been six others. Smaller, lesser, they came about because we missed some people in 1986, so we had to pass a few more amnesties to catch up and kind of clean up those people that are here in this country. And the promise in 1986 was, well, but this is the last time. This time we really mean it, in 1986; this time we are really going to enforce the law. This time we are going to make sure that we seal and control our border. This time we are going to be 100 percent confident that the Federal Government is going to do their job. 1986.

And, you know, there was some enforcement going on in 1986. And it didn't take very long before we had a new President and then another new President, and then in 1992 we got President Clinton. And I was appalled at the lax approach that President Clinton had in enforcing our immigration laws. That is when I started to pay attention because I saw that there were people that were being naturalized before the 1996 election, particularly in California, perhaps a million of

them, who were hustled through the process and went to the polls and voted. And they knew their duty. Go to the polls and vote. Vote for the President. That is the way you say thank you for getting hustled through the citizenship process. That was appalling to me. A million people, many of them in California.

Those people, some of them have, for want of a better term, matriculated to Iowa in order to, and gone to work there, and that is how I hear these things, they come up there, a million people.

Today, a million people sounds like chump change, Mr. Speaker. A million people coming into the United States quickly under the Clinton administration. But, the facts are, employers during the Clinton administration were far more likely to be sanctioned and punished for hiring illegals than they are today. Under the Clinton administration, they were 19 times more likely to be sanctioned by the administration for hiring illegals than they are today. The risk was 19 times greater. That is how much enforcement has diminished over the last 20 years.

1986 to 2006 enforcement of immigration laws has gone down to the point where it is almost nonexistent. Border control has not been anything that alarmed anyone in this administration until they got an alarm that they weren't going to be able to get their guest worker plan passed, and then that alarm sent out the message that said, we are going to have to position ourselves so that America sees that we are going to enforce the laws. So we have got a few more Border Patrol agents. We have got a commitment to send the National Guard down there. We have got speeches that talk about a virtual fence. And I would say that a virtual fence is not going to keep out the forces that are pushing on that border.

Now, I could talk about this border to significant lengths. I have been there about four times in the last year. But I think that those trips down to the border are far less than those that have been made by my friend from Colorado. And my friend from Colorado has been on this issue, I believe, his entire congressional life.

I have been on it my entire public life and before. I grew up believing in the rule of law. It wasn't something that we conceived of sanctuary policies, or we didn't think that because we were a municipality or a county or a State that we didn't cooperate in enforcing Federal law. Law is law and we have to work together at all levels to enforce all laws.

And issue after issue has been brought to this floor and before the American people by my colleague from Colorado, and I would be very happy and honored to yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TOM TANCREDO.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his efforts on

behalf of the American people. I appreciate especially his efforts on behalf of those of us, well, in fact, the American people who are demanding that something be done here in the Congress of the United States to deal with the fact that people are coming into this country by the hundreds of thousands, in fact, by the millions. And they are coming in without our permission, and they are coming in without our knowledge, and they are essentially destroying the concept of the rule of law which is, of course, one of the building blocks of this great Nation.

And it is right that they should look to the Congress of the United States for some sort of action. And it is only because so much pressure has been placed on this body and on the Senate that we are seeing the kinds of bills coming forward that are ostensibly designed to deal with it.

I believe that the House bill we passed last December was a good step in the direction of dealing with illegal immigration. It was an enforcement-only bill. It did not provide amnesty to anyone who is presently here illegally. And that is the definition.

By the way, if you say to someone, let's get this straight, because this has really been the bane of our contest between the House and the Senate, in terms of what do we mean by "amnesty"?

□ 1745

The President has said and many Members of the Senate have said that their bill and that their idea is not amnesty because it does not provide automatic citizenship to people who are here illegally. And you have to ask yourself, as we ask them all the time, What law dictionary did you ever read that had that definition of "amnesty"?

Amnesty is, of course, when you do not provide the penalty that is prescribed by the law that has been violated. That is amnesty. So if you have come into this country illegally, there is a law that you have violated. What is the penalty? It is, under the law today, that you be deported.

Now, when you say to people that we are going to disregard that; that you can, in fact, be here illegally; that we will ignore that entirely, that now you may have to pay a fine or may have to do a couple of other little things; and, therefore, what I am saying is not amnesty, that is wrong, and it should not be allowed to go without being called because, frankly, they are trying to confuse the American people. And they want to go out and tout some sort of bill that will be, "enforcement only," but it will have this component: It will have a guest worker/amnesty component. Every single one of the bills over there has that. Some of the bills that have been introduced over here have that particular component.

So it is our duty, and my colleague has done a great job on this, to identify the problems and pointing out when people over on our side, even, try to in-

troduce legislation and, again, cloud the issue of amnesty, that we have got to be clear with the American people. This is far too important, and we cannot allow ourselves the great latitude that is designed in most of these bills to go out there and say we have dealt with immigration, because we have not.

You can see the fact that it is reaching a boiling point in America, and one way of determining that is to see what is happening in the States. And it is amazing because States now are taking on this issue because the Congress will not. States like Georgia and Alabama and Florida, and now we can add to the list Colorado, which recently passed a bill that came out of a special session called by the Governor. Now, this is amazing in and of itself, a special session of a State legislature. They had gone out of session.

The Governor called them back and said, You have got to deal with something here. And what was that something? Was it the prison system? No. It was illegal immigration, because, of course, the State of Colorado, like every State, is being impacted by this problem and impacted negatively. The costs are enormous. And so they were called into special session, and Colorado did pass a bill. By the way, a Democrat legislature that could not figure out a way to not pass it. I mean, they tried everything imaginable to avoid it, and finally they had to come to the point where they did pass legislation that will restrict social service benefits to people who are presently legally in the State of Colorado. And this is an amazing thing.

Like I say, Georgia has passed, I think, perhaps the best series of laws on this issue. The State of Alabama has contracted with the Federal Government in a memorandum of understanding saying that the State police will identify to ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, officials everyone they come in contact with who is an illegal immigrant and those people will in turn be taken away by ICE. That is an agreement they have come up with. Florida is following in their footsteps.

This is happening throughout the United States, and I am happy to see it. But it only points out that there has been a dereliction of duty here at the Federal level because clearly this is one of the constitutional areas that is clearly defined as Federal. I mean, it is our role. It is our responsibility. It falls on our shoulders.

Sixteen sheriffs along the border in Texas formed together an alliance to try to defend their border. I mean, what does that tell us here? They look to us for support. And one of the things they were asking for, by the way, was just financial aid so they could buy equipment and arms to be as well armed as the people they were facing on the other side of the border.

It is about time that we do something, but that something has to be

substantive. It cannot be eyewash. And it is going to be our duty, yours and mine and others who care about this issue, to bring to the attention of the American public exactly what is going on here, the nature of the bills that are being introduced. We have to be very specific, and we cannot let people cloud the issue.

So I just again want to thank my colleague from Iowa for the yeoman's work he has been doing on this and the fact that he has done exactly what I have said. He has identified bills that have been introduced, even by our own colleagues over here, specifically Mr. PENCE, and explained why those bills are, in fact, also amnesty. I mean, that bill is, in fact, amnesty, and others like it have an amnesty provision to it that people can get citizenship if they are here illegally under those bills. Even though there are all these protestations to the contrary, the fact is that that is still what is being pushed. The other side will do anything to get a guest worker/amnesty plan, including the suggestion that it will all be done under a guise of enforcement first. We have to be very careful.

And I just, again, want to thank my colleague for his efforts on behalf of the people of this country on especially this issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

It is important, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are able to hear that direct message from the Colorado State legislature. That is an amazing thing beyond the conception of us, I think, here a year or two or three ago, let alone four or five or six when this issue first came up. And I would even go back to my recollection in 1996, when Pat Buchanan ran for the Presidency and he said, I will call hearings. I will make sure we have a national debate on immigration.

And that was what we lacked in 1996. That is what Mr. TANCREDO has been working for for all of these years he has been in this Congress. We are at this point now where you cannot avoid a national debate on immigration. It is everywhere. It is in the coffee shop. It is at work. It is here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. It is in our churches. It is in our homes. It is absolutely everywhere. And the reason is because it has gotten so bad that Americans are being personally impacted piece by piece by piece. They are standing up saying, What can I do within the jurisdiction that I have, within the resources that I have? How can I step in and fix this? And we have seen other States take action too. There have been 8 or 10 States that have had some kind of legislative immigration activity going on. And so I applaud them for that.

And the Minutemen, I had the privilege to go down to the border of Arizona and Mexico and help build some fence to get some of that project started. And I happen to have a list of 25 Members of Congress that would be happy to help put some fence up to be able to control this border.

But I want to lay a little groundwork for that before I yield to my colleagues. And that is this: that an administration that had the determination to shut off the jobs magnet and enforce the laws at our borders; if we had the ability and the will to enforce our borders and shut off that jobs magnet, and add into that shutting off birthright citizenship, which is another magnet that brings people here and starts that chain migration for up to 350,000 babies every year that should not have been born in the United States of America, those kinds of decisions from an administration that was committed could have kept this under manageable proportions.

But what really has happened is that lack of commitment has allowed for a lack of enforcement. The lack of enforcement, that message echoes through the entire countries south of our border, on the Rio Grande and at our border with Mexico. When that happens, it magnetizes and more people come into the United States.

Now we have a situation where 4 million people a year pour across our southern border. Four million. And I went down there and repeated what the Border Patrol tells me here in hearings, that they stop perhaps 25 to 33 percent, a fourth to a third of the illegal border crossers. And they are not very free about talking about what percentage of drugs they interdict coming down there. They will talk about the tonnage, but not the percentage. They say 25 to 33 percent of the border crossers they stop.

And I say that to the Border Patrol people who are down there sitting in a nice quiet place where they do not have to worry about a superior listening in on them. And some of them laughed when I said, You are stopping 25 percent, maybe 33 percent? Some of them laughed. None of them said yes. One of them went into hysterics and said, 25 percent? We are not stopping anywhere near 25 percent.

I asked them all what is the number. The most common number I got was perhaps 10 percent. I had one of the high-level investigators tell me we stop about 3 percent of the illegal crossers and about 5 percent of the illegal drugs. But the power and the force of this is just awesome. It is \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across our southern border, and that is a powerful force, Mr. Speaker. That force is so powerful that even if we shut off all illegal people coming across the border, even if we shut off the jobs magnet here in the United States, even if we end birthright citizenship to shut off that magnet, that does nothing to shut off the \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs.

And that is why we have got to build a fence, and that is why we have got to build a wall. That is not an administrative decision on whether to enforce or not, whether to deploy people or not, or whether to actually arrest them and prosecute them. That is a physical bar-

rier, not an administrative decision. That is why it is important, Mr. Speaker.

And I would be happy to yield to my friend from Virginia who raised this issue with a powerful voice on immigration.

Mr. GOODE. Thank you, Mr. KING. I want to thank you for having this hour to address this most important topic. I also want to thank Congressman TANCREDI for his tireless efforts over about an 8-year period.

I was thinking the other day when the Immigration Reform Caucus first started that there was a handful of Members, and I believe it was around 1998 or 1999 when it first began. And now I think there are over 100 Members in that caucus. Well over a third of the House is in the Immigration Reform Caucus. And the issue received very little attention prior to September 11. After that the issue received greater attention.

I will have to say that I remember the days in the late 1990s when Mr. TANCREDI would come over here, and others who would talk on this issue, and it was almost as if he had leprosy. They did not want to talk about the issue. But the issue is probably the burning issue in the country today. If not, it is certainly in the top three.

And I want to thank Mr. KING, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. MILLER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WILSON, and a number of other persons that are here tonight focusing on this issue which is so crucial to the future of the United States of America.

If the massive invasion is not stopped, we are going to be flooded to the extent that we will drift into third world status. For our children and for our grandchildren, we cannot fail on this issue.

You mentioned magnets, and that is the reason so many come.

Let us talk for a minute about amnesty. In my district there are some persons, I am pretty sure, here illegally, in the United States, and it is common sense, street talk about why they come. They say if we can get across the border, swim the Rio Grande, or walk across the mountains, avoid the dangers and the pitfalls of the gyrating temperatures, if we can get to this country and we just stay here a few years, history tells us we will get an amnesty and we will be okay. We can avoid the checks that all the others go through. We can avoid the background checks. We can avoid the health checks. We can avoid the security reviews that going through a regular visa process or becoming an H-1B or an H-2B or an H-2A worker involves.

□ 1800

Amnesty is the magnet. Other magnets that you mentioned are anchor babies who get benefits in this country and employer deductions for employees, even if they are here illegally, which Mr. KING is addressing. There are a number of other magnets,

but probably the biggest magnet is the notion, if I can get there just for a little while and stay a couple of years, I will be safe; I will never have to go back.

There will be some in that body across the hall or in the executive branch down at Pennsylvania Avenue saying there is nothing we can do; they are here now, we cannot be firm. But I would submit to you, as some of you on this issue have stated in the past, if we were to draw a line in the sand and say the Senate bill that includes amnesty would never become law, we will never have it in this country, we are putting a line in the sand tonight in saying no amnesty under any conditions, those that marched in by the tens of thousands would likely march out by the tens of thousands because they would know then that their hope for an amnesty like that which occurred in 1986 and like that which occurred under President Clinton would not happen again.

Failure to address this issue with firmness and forcefulness is creating a dangerous situation in this country. We have all talked about how those who would do us harm can infiltrate and become part of the flood that rolls into America day after day, hour after hour, and week after week. We must secure our borders.

We only have to look at the prison population in the United States. I serve on the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee of Appropriations. The head of the Department of the Federal Bureau of Prisons testified before our subcommittee just a couple of months ago, there are 189,000 persons incarcerated in the Federal penal system. Of that 189,000, 50,000 of them, according to him, are illegal aliens. Think how much we could reduce the Federal prison costs if we had no illegal aliens in this country. Think how much you could reduce local jail costs and State prison costs. That percentage of incarcerated illegal aliens far exceeds the percentage of illegal aliens in our current population.

I would like to close by mentioning deficit reduction. I hear many persons across the 5th District of Virginia, around the Commonwealth and in other parts of our country say, we need to get the deficit under control, we need to be in a position in this country of not having a deficit. When you add up the impact of illegal immigration on our local governments, our State governments and our own Federal Government, you are talking around \$70 billion per year, and that is probably a low estimate.

Stop illegal immigration by saying "no" to amnesty ever, and by adopting a number of the measures that the fighters for border security support, and we will go a long way towards ending the deficit in this country.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to address you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia

(Mr. GOODE) and appreciate particularly the strong voice that you have been, solid and consistent and strong. I remember you were at one point saying, I want a wall and I want it 2,000 miles long and I want it from San Diego to Brownsville. I am looking forward to the day when that last mile gets built, and by then maybe we will have the kind of border security that we need.

But Californians have a long experience with the border control issue, and one of the leaders on this issue is the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), and I am very happy to yield to him.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for yielding.

I represent the 42nd Congressional District in California, and for those of you who have not been to California, I do not truly believe you understand the concept of illegal immigration.

When I hear my colleagues, and individuals I consider friends, they get up before us and say, a guest worker program is needed to fill those jobs that Americans will not do, I guess you have to define what are the jobs we are offering Americans. What wages are they offering Americans to work is probably the best question.

The National Journal, in fact, did a study that I know determined in 1973 that the average manufacturing job in nonmanagerial service work paid about \$15.24 an hour. At that time, you could get a job in construction, in manufacturing, most businesses. A man or woman could afford to own a home, send their kids to school, live a good, quality life and plan for the future. The problem was that in 2004, those jobs that in 1973 paid \$15.24 an hour, paid \$15.26 an hour.

Talk to the individual who was a carpenter, who was a plumber, who poured concrete, who did masonry, who was honorably employed by a manufacturing company, that was paid good wages, and you saw this dramatic change start to occur during the recession in California of the 1990s. All of the sudden things were tighter. People started hiring individuals here in this country for a much lesser wage than the American citizen was willing to do that job for.

A good example, I remember seeing dry-wallers being laid off and an illegal being hired. It is not that illegals are bad people. By and large, they are really good people. They are just trying to come here to better their lives. So it is not a matter of race or discrimination. It is just the fact that can the United States accept all the poor that this world wants to send here? And if we decided to do that, why not accept them from India? Why not accept them from Asia? Why not accept them from anyplace in the world and double, triple, quadruple our population if we are just going to be benevolent and accept people who are poor and want to better their lives?

But the problem you have, and this is back to the dry-waller, then you see an illegal hanging dry wall and his wife and kids are going behind him nailing the dry wall off to get the job done quicker so the husband could produce more at a much lesser rate than the American citizen was paid before.

Now, how do you explain that to the American who was born here, who was educated here, who perhaps does not want to put a suit and tie on to go to work in the morning, who wants to work with his hands in that job that he is very capable of doing, but cannot afford to do for the reduced rate that an illegal is willing to work for? How do you tell that man he cannot support his family, educate his children and cannot afford a home anymore?

In the National Journal, it is not me saying it, it is them saying it, that over 30 years later we are paying 2 cents per hour on average more than we were paying in 1993. I do not think Members of Congress who, as I say, get up and put a suit on in the morning and wear ties understand that people working for a living in this country are those who are most impacted by what we have done.

We have to hold employers accountable. For an employer to say, well, I just do not know; well, that is unrealistic, because we have a pilot program today that any employer in this country can go verify whether that individual is a citizen or not. If you are unwilling to do that and you hire questionable employees that you know or you suspect are not here legally, you are violating the laws of this country. The sad thing is, the violation of that law is hurting American workers who would love to have that job.

Are there some jobs in this country that I think we maybe need to look at? I think after we enforce the current laws that are on the books, or we pass new laws to stop illegal immigration, then let us look at the jobs that we do need to fill. I do not think there is an argument by many people that the agricultural industry, farmers, are probably going to need some labor. We have needed them historically since World War II, and before we had a program that took care of that.

So there are certain industries, whether it be landscaping, gardening, I do not know if we have got to have them for food services, but I think there are certain industries where we are probably going to recognize that we do need some guest worker programs.

But to come in with a concept, let us just have a guest worker program for anybody who wants to hire somebody at a wage an American citizen is not willing to work at is an absolutely unreasonable approach to a very real problem that is not getting better daily.

We talk about an amnesty program, which is what I consider the Senate bill to be. In 1986, we allowed amnesty, and what did it get us? Nothing. It created more citizens of those who were here il-

legal, but we did nothing to enforce the law after we allowed amnesty for those that were here illegally.

The American citizens, the people I represent, do not believe us anymore, and they do not believe us for good reason. What we told them that we were going to do in 1986 we did not do.

I think we need to go pass a law today, a new law that is strict, enforceable and specific on what we are going to allow and not allow. We need to prove to the American people that we are going to send law-breakers back and we are going to hold employers accountable for hiring people that are here illegally.

Now, one argument that I hear repeatedly is, well, what are you going to do with all the people that came here illegally? They came here for a job, and if there is no job, they will go back home. The government does not need to provide buses. The government needs to remove the incentives that allow people to live here.

There are many. We need to crack down on employers, number one. We need to prohibit access to credit and financial service. We need to prevent illegals from gaining access to food stamps, low-income housing and health care.

I cannot go to Mexico and buy a house. They will not allow me to. Well, why should somebody come to this country illegally, violating the laws of this country, and be eligible to do something that they will not allow us to do in their own country?

Can you imagine going to Mexico and saying, I want a ballot printed in English? I want you to teach my children English in school? I want you to provide free health care at the emergency ward at the hospital for them? And I want you to allow me to stay here when you know I am staying in violation of your laws?

If I go to Mexico illegally, they will arrest me, confiscate my assets and deport me immediately. Those who come here from those countries act like we are being abusive when they came from a country where they have not in any way tolerated what we are told we have to tolerate here.

Now, it does not amaze me that when we send a bill out of the House to stop this problem, that Mexico and South American countries would oppose it. Well, why would they not oppose it? It does not benefit their interests. Their interests are sending anybody to this country, helping them come to this country, provide information to them to come to this country so they can earn money and send it back to their home country. Well, that is wrong.

This is the Congress of the United States of America, and this Congress should protect American citizens first, understanding that in South America and Mexico there are very good people. They are our neighbors; there is no argument about that. But if they want to come here, they should come here the same way I have gone to their country;



and that is go there with a visa, go there with a passport, and when I am through, I come home. I cannot just overstay my welcome as long as I deem that I should be there. I have to come home or they will send me home.

We welcome them into our country if they want to come on vacation, come to visit their families or come to do what they want to do, but at the given time, you go home and you do not come here illegally to get a job thinking you are going to stay in violation of the laws this country has placed upon the books.

Now, we are either a country of laws or we are not a country of laws, and today, we do not enforce the laws of this country at all. This concept we have in the Senate bill of earned citizenship will absolutely bankrupt our social fabric in this country. We cannot spend \$50 billion a year, as it is estimated, on those coming to this country who, once they become citizens, are eligible for every program on the social books that we have in this country. We cannot afford it. We should not tolerate it.

Go to California and look at the impact on schools. I have talked to teachers who said they are holding this class back because the bulk of the student body in that class do not speak English. Now, yes, it is a benefit to those kids who are here illegally because they are being educated, but it is a tremendous detriment to the children of American citizens who are being held back because the rest of the class cannot speak English to be moved forward.

□ 1815

Go to an emergency ward in California. You will wait for hours. People go there that are illegal, cannot speak English, for a sprained ankle, for a headache, for a cold, for basic health care. That is not what an emergency ward is for. And who is paying the bill? The people who use the hospital, who are having to subsidize it because they are losing money treating illegals.

We are a compassionate country. There is no doubt about it. If someone is here and they have had an emergency and they need to go to the hospital, they should be treated. You should allow nobody to suffer, nobody to die, but you cannot tolerate 12 to 20 million people coming here with this concept that health care is free, because when they get it they do not have to pay it.

Well, you cannot blame them for that. The people you can blame are the people in this room, for not making sure the laws passed by this Congress are enforced in this country. We can no longer tolerate it. Once again, they are good people that are trying to get here, by and large not bad people. But the American citizen cannot afford it.

It is our responsibility, first of all, to protect and defend our borders. We are not doing it. And we should be concerned about the future of America and

American citizens. Hopefully, when this debate continues and enough good people come here and talk about the impact on this country, we will fix the wrong that has occurred and make sure it does not happen again.

Thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) for that presentation and that perspective. It is a little bit different one than I often bring to this debate, and very glad that it is here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and am glad that it is something that the American people can pick up on as well.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, I am going to do the 2-minute drill on the King Wall on the border. I come to this conclusion this way. As the gentleman, Mr. MILLER, made the statement that people come here and work and send their money back. And that dollar figure now is \$20 billion that gets sent out of the labor here in the United States. Many of it is the labor of the people that are working here illegally. \$20 billion to Mexico. Another \$20 billion to Central America and the Caribbean. \$40 billion out of this economy being sent out by people who come here that undercut the wages of American people.

\$40 billion going south. \$65 billion going south to pay for the \$65 billion dollars worth of illegal drugs that come across our porous border. And they used to take that, and maybe still do, bring in some of those drugs on semis. There are places that the border is not even marked. So they can drive across the desert; they can drive their own road. In New Mexico, for example, the border, you would never know you crossed the border there, because when they finally set that border up, they set one of those big old big brass transits, probably not a lot different than Lewis and Clark had back in those days, and looked across at the horizon and put a concrete pylon up on top of the highest point of the horizon, lined up on that and then said, okay, now we will go to the next horizon, put up another one. That is all that is there.

And so there are roads that are made that cross the border a lot of places; the channel of the Rio Grande River gets driven across a lot of places. A place that is infamous, now called Neeley's Crossing, where they bring drugs across there and defend that border and threaten Americans that want to seal that off.

All this is going on, Mr. Speaker, and a lot of it is not just the force of people that want to come here for a little better life, not people who just want to pick lettuce or tomatoes or go work in a sheet rock crew or whatever it is, but \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs.

So whatever we might do to shut off the jobs magnet is not going to shut off those illegal drugs. That is another force. And that force is far more powerful than the desire for people to change their lifestyle.

So when I go down there and sit on that border, what I do is I have come to this conclusion: we cannot shut that off unless we build a fence and a wall. I want to put the fence in, but I want to put a wall in. I designed one. And this just simply is the desert floor. Put a trench in that desert floor.

We have the ability to put together a machine that would be a slip-form machine that would lay a footing, about like this, Mr. Speaker, if I give you a look at the end of that, so you would have that about 5 foot deep underneath the ground. That would keep the wall from tipping over.

We would pour a notch in it that allows us to put precast panels in. It would look like this, only this would be flush with the desert floor. And then you would bring in precast concrete panels, 10 feet wide, 13½ feet tall. They would construct it to be a 12-foot finished wall, just like that, Mr. Speaker.

Drop these panels in together, in this fashion, just take a crane and drop them in, Arnold Construction Company could build a mile a day of this pretty easily once you got your system going. And it is not all going to work, the whole 2,000 miles are not going to work that way, but a lot of it will work this way, Mr. Speaker.

And so just to wrap up this construction, this would be an example then of how that wall would look. Now you can also, you deconstruct it the same way. You can take it back down. If somehow they got their economy working, and got their laws working in Mexico, we can pull this back out just as easy as we can put it in. We can open it up again and we can open it up and let livestock run through there or whatever we choose.

I also say we need to do a few other things on top of that wall, and one of them being to put a little bit of wire on top here to provide a disincentive for people to climb over the top or put a ladder there.

We could also electrify this wire with the kind of current that would not kill somebody, but it would be a discouragement for them to be fooling around with it. We do that with livestock all the time. So I submit we build a wall like this, we do it for as many miles as we can, as many miles as we need, but it is roughly going to be 2,000.

And when you do that, then the Border Patrol that we are spending \$8 billion to protect 2,000 miles of border, \$4 million a mile, we can build this wall for about \$1.3 million a mile. If we do that, then that frees up our forces to be effective. And this would force the traffic through the ports of entry rather than across that vast open space that we have between San Diego and Brownsville.

This will be economically feasible. The \$4 million a mile, we can make an investment of about \$1.3 million for each mile, and that is only one time one year. Otherwise, we are paying Border Patrol \$4 million a mile every single year. What do we get out of it?

\$65 billion worth of illegal drugs and 4 million people coming across the border. This will shut off almost all of that. This will direct almost all of it through our ports of entry.

Those are the reasons, some of them, not all of them, Mr. Speaker, on why we need to build a wall. But in the brief time that we have, I want to make sure that I can yield to the gentleman from Georgia who has been such an eloquent voice on this issue.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KING very much for controlling the time in this hour. I thank him for yielding, and certainly Mr. MILLER and Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GOODE and others that have spoken during this hour. Those are the eloquent voices on this issue. They are not crazy voices. They are voices that are basically saying, you know, we got laws in this country and we need to enforce them.

We need to secure our borders first and foremost before we consider any other options in regard to things like a temporary worker program or what to do with the estimated 12 million people here that have been in this country for various and sundry periods of time illegally, most of them working, yes. There is no way in the world you can determine really how long they are here because of fraudulent documents.

But the ideas that have been proffered, like the idea that my friend from Iowa has suggested in regard to this, because I do not know if we need a fence, Mr. Speaker, for 2,000 miles all of the way from Brownsville to San Diego, but we definitely need some fencing. There is no question about it. There are certain areas of our southern border that you cannot control without the type of fencing that Mr. KING has described.

And we need to do that. In fact, in this body, in this House of Representatives, in our bill that we passed, actually we passed two bills over the last couple of years, the first one being the REAL ID Act, which is exactly what the 9/11 Commission has asked for, that bipartisan commission in unanimous fashion, we responded to exactly what they were asking us to do in the REAL ID Act.

Then we followed up with the Border Security Act toward the end of 2005, calling, Mr. Speaker, for 750 miles of fencing, not 2,000, but 750. What does the Senate do? They come along with a bill that calls for about maybe 300 miles of fencing, at the very most 370 miles.

My friend, Mr. KING, who has been such a strong advocate on this issue of border security knows that that is totally, totally inadequate, particularly if you are talking about the dense population centers below our border States. I know in the REAL ID Act, we finally completed 14 miles of fencing at the San Diego border that the environmentalists had blocked for years because of some endangered shrub the hordes of illegals that were crossing trample those shrubs down pretty ef-

fectively, taking care of any concerns that the environmentalists may have had.

But listen to some of the things that are in the bill on the Senate side compared to what we have passed on the House side. They would allow guest workers, so-called guest workers to be paid the prevailing wage. That is the Obama amendment, when American citizens do not have to be paid prevailing wage.

They expand the visa waiver program to countries in the European Union in good standing with the United States and allow the State Department discretion for adding new member countries. Mr. Speaker, we need to suspend the visa waiver program. We absolutely, after 9/11, this idea of saying that people can come into this country with a passport, no visa, and stay for 90 days, no way of knowing exactly who they are, just a routine stamp of a passport, and then they may or may not go home after that vacation or that summer that they spend in one of our colleges or universities, and we do not know where they are.

We need, and we called for this in the PATRIOT Act, we called for this in the 9/11 Act, that we knew, we could verify entry and exit. Until we can do that, the idea of expanding, Mr. Speaker, the visa waiver program is ridiculous.

The bottom line is this. I think the House has got it right. I think the Senate has it wrong. We need to secure our borders first and foremost. And no amnesty. I yield back. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I yield back, Mr. Speaker.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to come to the House floor. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour. The 30-something Working Group, as you know, comes to the floor if not daily every other day when we have the opportunity to do so, to share with the Members of the House initiatives and plans that we have on the Democratic side of the aisle that will make America better and stronger.

As you know, we have been on the message of a new direction for America, and we have been working very hard on that because that is the message that we have and that the American people are looking forward to seeing implemented.

So many times here on this floor, we talk about ideas and concepts, but they never really make it to the legislative debate, due to the fact that here in the House, Democrats are in the minority;

and the majority has adopted a rule that there is not a true bipartisan spirit here in this House, only when we vote on post offices and naming bridges.

But when it comes down to policy, policy that is affecting the people that we represent every day, there is a great divide, a divide to where we are not sitting down at the negotiating table, in committee, in subcommittee, and definitely not sitting down before legislation comes to the floor in a conference committee to talk about what is best for America and how can we make it better.

The American people yearn and hope for Democrats and Republicans and the one Independent in this House to work together. I think it is important to outline the fact that our leadership has said if given the opportunity, earning the opportunity of the American people to lead, that you will see a bipartisan spirit, not only spirit, you will see bipartisan action in this House on major pieces of legislation dealing with health care, education, how we are going to balance the budget, just not talk on how to cut the deficit in half or we may cut the deficit in half, really breaking down the deficit so that we will not pay more than what we are spending and investing in education, homeland security, and veteran affairs.

That is why we come to the floor. And we start talking about a new direction for America, making sure that health care through prescription drugs, and also making sure that HMOs eliminate wasteful spending and a number of other reforms that should take place there so that we do not have so many Americans going into emergency rooms.

Also lowering the price of gas and achieving energy independence is one of our major goals. There was just a report that was released by the Agriculture Department that is now having some sort of discussion about ethanol and what we can use, how we can use the ethanol and how it can play a role in making us independent, the E-85, and our proposal of putting America on a new direction or in a new direction.

□ 1830

We talk about the importance of alternative fuels, not just investing in the Middle East and not investing in the Midwest. So we look forward to continuing to push that philosophy here on this floor as we have the opportunity to lead this House, knowing the American people can deliver that, making sure that working families making more than what is presently the minimum wage, increasing that minimum wage, making sure they are able to bring home more to their families.

Millions of Americans are living on the minimum wage. It has been very difficult. And we have charts here, Mr. Speaker, that would illustrate how the minimum wage, we haven't seen a national minimum wage hike since 1997,